REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1-19 and added claims 20 and 21. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Objections to the Drawings:

Applicants respectfully request that drawing sheets 3 and 4 containing figures identified by Examiner be cancelled. Drawing sheet 1 containing figure 1 and drawing sheet 2 containing figure 2 remain part of the application. Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings.

Response to Objections to the Specification:

Applicants have amended the specification at page 2 lines 1-4 deteting reference to specific claims as suggested by Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the objections to the specification.

Response to Objections to the Claims:

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 as suggested by Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the objections to the claims.

Response to rejections under Section 102(b)

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 9 claiming

1. **Rejections anticipated by Tobery (US 4,962,640):**

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by Tobery (US 4,962,640). The Examiner apparently reads Tobery as teaching a turbine vane comprising a hollow inset arranged between the turbine vane platforms and stretching into a recess that is provided in the platform so that areas of the inset with reduced predefined flow rates are present for forming a particle trap in the inset base area.

Tobery teaches air bled from the cavity through a hole at the inboard end of the insert sized such that particles entrained in the cooling air are carried out of the cavity, preventing them

from plugging the distribution holes (Column 3 line 67 to Column 4 line 3). In contrast, Applicants claimed invention teaches a recess provided in the platform located immediately opposite the base, wherein the inset stretches into the recess to establish zones in an extension of the inset having reduced predefined flow rates defining a particle trap in a base area of the inset. Tobery does not teach or suggest zones having reduced flow rates in the base area of the inset. Furthermore, Tobery teaches away from this concept, as noted above.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1and associated dependent claims are patentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

2. Rejections anticipated by Papageorgiou (US 5,511,937):

Claims 1-7, and 9-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by Papageorgiou (US 5,511,937). The Examiner apparently reads Papageorgiou as teaching a turbine vane comprising a recess that is provided in the platform located immediately opposite the base wherein the inset stretches into the recess so that areas with reduced predefined flow rates are present for forming a particle trap in the inset base area.

Like Tobery, Papageorgiou does not teach or suggest a recess provided in the platform located immediately opposite the base, wherein the inset stretches into the recess to establish zones in an extension of the inset having reduced predefined flow rates defining a particle trap in a base area of the inset.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 and 9-19 are patentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Discussion of new claims 20 and 21:

New dependant claims 20 and 21 further define the scope of the invention, as described in the specification and drawings. New claim 20 is dependent on claim 1 and is patentable based on this dependency, as well as on its own merits. For example, claim 20 recites the zone is a standing eddy where the flow rate is approximately zero. New claim 29 is dependent on claim 9 and is patentable based on this dependency, as well as on its own merits. Additionally, claim 21

also recites the zone is a standing eddy where the flow rate is approximately zero. Applicant thus respectfully requests allowance of claims 20 and 21.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/6/05

By: _____
John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830